REVIEW AND COMMENT RECORD

1. Page 1 of 2

2. Date: March 24, 1993

3. Document No./Title: Technical Memorandum 10: Soil Sampling Plan -- Surface Disturbance Areas, OU 5, February, 1993

Reviewing Person and/or Agency: DOE-HQ

Date: 1993

Item	Old Section or Paragraph	Comment(s)	Disposition	Status
GENERAL COMMENT		The Document does not clarify why the surface disturbance areas need to be sampled either at depth or on the surface. Although the soil sampling was indicated in the Operable Unit (OU) 5 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Facility Assessment/Remedial Investigation (RFI/RI) and Interagency Agreement, this document has demonstrated that there is no current or Historical evidence, site reconnaissance, or existing analytical data to indicate that hazardous or radioactive materials are present at these sites. Based on the discussion in the text, it appears that the entire soil sampling plan can be abandoned. If sampling is necessary, the document should clearly present the data quality objectives for each component part, screening, borings, and surface soil samples. When considering the site history, the screening results may be sufficient to make a determination of no further action.	Clearly stated that history is unknown, not that there is no history.	Done, PJJ
Specific Comments				
1	Section 1.1 Page 1, third paragraph	To support the decision to reduce the number of boring at these sites, the discussion should include a statement that there is no history of hazardous waste disposal at these locations.	Clearly stated that history is unknown, not that there is no history.	Done PJJ

ADMIN RECORD

A-OU05-000136

REVIEW AND COMMENT RECORD

1. Page 2 of 2

2. Date: March 24, 1993

3. Document No./Title: Technical Memorandum 10: Soil Sampling Plan -- Surface Disturbance Areas, OU 5, February, 1993

Reviewing Person and/or Agency: DOE-HQ **Date:** 1993

Item	Old Section or Paragraph	Comment(s)	Disposition	Status
2	Section 1.1 Page 2 first paragraph	This discussion should include a description of the core log. Such a description would be useful in evaluating the geochemical information. The analysis for tritium is unclear; please clarify how a determination of mg/kg was made for this contaminant. (Normally this type of analysis is quantified in units of radioactivity such as, picocuries.) Also, it is stated that "several" volatile organic compounds (VOCs) detected were flagged as being less than the detection limit or as being present in laboratory blanks. Please specify the VOCs.	Brief description of log has been included. Mg/kg for tritium changed to pCi/l. Volatiles have been named.	Done PJJ
3	Section 3.1 Page 9 first paragraph	Please provide the rationale for stopping the drilling at 12 ft.. Section 1.1 indicated that if any contamination is present at these sites, it occurs at greater than 20 ft..	Drilling depth has been changed to six feet into bedrock.	Done PJJ
4	Section 3.2 Page 9 fourth paragraph	Please clarify why groundwater samples are being taken from these borings since groundwater contamination has not been mentioned as problem in these areas. Also, discuss whether 12 ft. is an adequate depth for retrieving groundwater samples.	"Problems" are not known but are suspected, which is why we are doing the investigation. Groundwater will only be sampled if it is encountered.	Done PJJ
5	Section 3.2 Page 10 last paragraph	Please clarify why these geotechnical samples are being taken and why only the upper 2 ft. are being sampled.	As specified in the Work Plan, but also for use in the Risk Assessment (i.e. can the near surface material blow away?).	Done PJJ
6	Section 4.0 Page 11	The necessity for the surface soil program is unclear. Based on the site history, it would appear that any soil sampling should be tied to "hits" from the screening surveys. Please discuss the objectives for the surface soil sampling program.	In addition, to "marked" surface soil locations, areas with "hits" will also be sampled.	Done PJJ